

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **April 6, 2004**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1-30. The drawings were objected to because of informalities. The specification was objected to because of informalities. Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite and failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-15, 17-18, 20-25, 27-28, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Sun Microsystems, Inc. (*Sun Cluster 2.2 API Developer's Guide*, hereinafter "Sun Cluster 2.2"). Claims 6, 16, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun Cluster 2.2, and further in view of Sun Microsystems, Inc. (*Application Packaging Developer's Guide*, hereinafter "APDG"). Claims 9, 19, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sun Cluster 2.2, and further in view of Lawlor et al. (USPN 6,038,677, hereinafter "Lawlor").

Objections to the drawings

The drawings were objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended the drawings as described in the Amendments to the Drawings section above. No new matter has been added.

Objections to the Specification

The specification was objected to because of informalities.

Applicant has amended the specification to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. No new matter has been added.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

Claim 9 was rejected as being indefinite and failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.

Applicant has amended claim 9 to provide antecedent basis for “said user interface.” This amendment finds support on page 8, paragraph [0027].

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Independent claims 1, 11, and 21 were rejected as being anticipated by Sun Cluster 2.2. Applicant respectfully points out that Sun Cluster 2.2 teaches **allowing a user to code** command-line utility programs (see Sun Cluster 2.2 , page 1-1, section 1.1, paragraph 1).

In contrast, the present invention **automatically generates** code for a resource type (see page 10, paragraph [0031] of the instant application). Automatically generating code for a resource type is beneficial because it reduces the need for manual coding and thereby reduces errors associated with manual coding. There is nothing within Sun Cluster 2.2, either explicit or implicit, which suggests automatically generating code for a resource type.


Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 11, and 21 to clarify that the present invention automatically generates code for a resource type. These amendments find support on page 10, paragraph [0031] of the instant application.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 11, and 21 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 2-10, which depend upon claim 1, claims 12-20, which depend upon claim 11, and claims 22-30, which depend upon claim 21, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47,615

Date: December 23, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665